UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/543,045	07/21/2005	Jeffrey Allen Cooper	PU030321	3888

24498   7590   11/09/2010
Robert D. Shedd, Patent Operations
THOMSON Licensing LLC
P.O. Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

EXAMINER
HOLDER, ANNER N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2483	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/09/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/543,045	COOPER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANNER HOLDER	2483	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08/31/10*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,5,7,11-17,19,21,23,24 and 28-32* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4,5,7,11-17,19,21,23,24 and 28-32* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 July 2005* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 08/30/10 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's arguments the Examiner respectfully disagrees. As to arguments present concerning claim 17, Matsushima discloses a decoder, [fig. 5 (15a and 15b); fig. 7 (15a and 15b)] coupled to the demultiplexer [fig. 6 (14)] and responsive to the error representative signal, for reproducing a content representative signal at a selectable desired quality. [abstract; fig. 6 (15a, 15b); col. 10 lines 32-40, 46-65; col. 11 lines 36-60] when correcting means fails an error signal is received by the decoder as well the selecting means choices the hindrance mode thus selecting the quality of the image. [col. 11 lines 36-60] Matsushima discloses the selection of image quality based upon the mode selection, which reads upon the claim limitations. Matsushima discloses the encoding and decoding of image data. The encoded signal contains information about "the respective qualities" where the encoded signal is transmitted to the decoder which performs mirror operations of an encoder. Logan teaches selecting the desired quality automatically comprises the step of selecting the desired quality in response to the status of the storage device. [col. 5 line 65 - col. 6 line 3] Logan discloses the adjustment of the quality based on available memory which is recieved by the processor from the memory, thus a status is sent from. The Applicant's claims does not exclude the modes as selection parameters. Taken in combination Matsushima, Yun and Logan discloses that the claimed limitations.

Double Patenting

2.   The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees.   A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and In *re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3.   Claims 1-5, 8-17, 19, 24, 29, and 32 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-16, 19, 24, and 27 of copending Application No. 10/542972. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they substantially claim the same scope of the invention. See comparison below.

Co-pending Application 10/542972	1	2	5	11-15	19	24	27
Present Application 10/543045	1	2	5	13-17	24	29	32

4.   Claim 1 of the present application   10/543045 corresponds with claim 1 of co-pending application 10/542972.

Claim 2 of the copending corresponds with claim 2 of the present application.

Claim 5 of the copending corresponds with claim 5 of the present application.

Claim 11 of the copending corresponds with claim 13 of the present application.

Claim 12 of the copending corresponds with claim 14 of the present application.

Claim 13 of the copending corresponds with claim 15 of the present application.

Claim 14 of the copending corresponds with claim 16 of the present application.

Claim 15 of the copending corresponds with claim 17 of the present application.

Claim 19 of the copending corresponds with claim 24 of the present application.

Claim 24 of the copending corresponds with claim 29 of the present application.

        This is a _provisional_ obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set for the in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 12, 17, 19, 21, 24 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushima et al. US 6,535,717 in view of Yun US

6,700,624.

7.   As to claim 1, Matsushima teaches a method for staggercasted content,

[abstract; figs. 3-5; col. 8 lines 31-40] comprising the steps of: encoding a set of signals

representing content, [fig. 3; fig. 5 (5a, 5b); col. 9 lines 5-14, 42-50] the set capable of

being decoded to produce a corresponding set of decoded signals, [fig. 6 (15a, 15b);

col. 10 lines 32-40, 53-65] each decoded signal having a quality different from the

qualities of the decoded signals corresponding to the other encoded signals; [fig. 6 (15a,

15b); col. 10 lines 32-40, col. 10 lines 13-20 - modulated signal is up converted and

amplified; col. 11 lines 18-25 - signal is down converted and demodulated; col. 10 lines

53 - col. 11 lines 6; the signals represent differing qualities being high quality signals

and low quality signals] generating a composite signal comprising the set of encoded

signals staggered in time; [abstract; fig. 3; fig. 5; col. 8 line 56 - col. 9 line 19 (emphasis

col. 9 lines 9-14 - the delay staggers the signals in time)] extracting the set of encoded

signals from the composite signal; [fig. 6; col. 10 lines 46-65 (emphasis lines 50-52)]

detecting errors in the set of extracted encoded signals to produce a subset of available

extracted encoded signals which are not erroneous; [fig. 6; col. 10 lines 46-65; col. 11

lines 36-60] decoding a content representative signal at a selectable desired quality.

[abstract; fig. 6 (15a, 15b); col. 10 lines 32-40, 46-65; col. 11 lines 36-60] <u>wherein the</u>

<u>step of generating a composite signal comprises the step of further including a signal</u>

<u>carrying information about the respective qualities of the encoded set of signals;</u>

[abstract; figs. 3-5; col. 8 lines 31-40; col. 3 lines 26-54; col. 4 lines 2-8, 30-44; fig. 11;

col. 10 lines 8-16] and wherein the decoding step comprises the step of selecting the

content representative signal at the desired quality automatically. [abstract; fig. 6 (15a,

15b); col. 10 lines 32-40, col. 10 lines 46 - col. 11 lines 6; col. 11 lines 36-60]

Matsushima does not explicitly teach storing the decoded content representative signal

in a storage device.

Yun discloses storing the decoded content representative signal in a storage device.

[fig. 7 (600 and 600-1); col. 5 lines 42-60; - it is well known in the art that a frame buffer

is a video output device that drives a video display from a memory buffer containing a

complete frame of data. Therefore, it is well known in the art that a frame buffer is a

required component of the decoder for displaying of video data.]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to incorporate the teachings of Yun with the device of Matsushima allowing

for viewer selection of preferred viewing quality of transmitted video.

Matsushima (modified by Yun) does not teach explicitly wherein the step of selecting

the desired quality automatically comprises the step of selecting the desired quality in

response to the status of the storage device.

Logan teaches wherein the step of selecting the desired quality automatically

comprises the step of selecting the desired quality in response to the status of the

storage device. [col. 5 line 65 - col. 6 line 3]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Logan with the teachings of Matsushima (modified by Yun) allowing for improved efficiency and storage capacity.

8.   As to claim 2, Matsushima (modified by Yun) teaches wherein if a content representative signal at the desired quality is not available, decoding a content representative signal at a selectable desired quality from the subset of available extracted encoded signals and storing the decoded content representative signal. [Matsushima - col. 10 line 53 - col. 11 line 6; Yun - fig. 7 (600 and 600-1); col. 5 lines 42-60; - it is well known in the art that a frame buffer is a video output device that drives a video display from a memory buffer containing a complete frame of data. Therefore, it is well known in the art that a frame buffer is a required component of the decoder for displaying of video data]

9.   As to claim 5, Matsushima (modified by Yun) teaches wherein the parameters are preset in response to user input. [Yun - abstract; col. 7 lines 41-65; col. 8 lines 40-48, 55-62; col. 9 line 54 - col. 10 line 7]

10.   As to claim 7, Matsushima (modified by Yun and Logan) teaches wherein if the status of the storage device indicates that the storage device is nearly full, the desired quality is automatically a lower quality. [Logan - col. 5 line 65 - col. 6 line 3]

11.   As to claim 11, Matsushima (modified by Yun) wherein the television program information carrying signal carries data representing either or both of a program map table (PMT) and a program and information systems protocol-virtual channel table

(PSIP-VCT). [Yun - col. 6 line 61-65; col. 8 line 55 - col. 9 line 12; col. 9 line 28 - PMT is

contained with the PSIP]

12.   As to claim 12, Matsushima (modified by Yun) wherein the composite signal

generating step comprises generating the set of encoded signals such that a lowest

quality decoded signal is undelayed, [fig. 5 (1, 2, 5b); col. 9 lines 1-19] and the other

encoded signals are delayed with respect to the encoded signal corresponding to the

lowest quality decoded signal such that the higher the quality of the corresponding

decoded signal, the longer the delay period. [fig. 5 (1 and 4); fig. 7 (1 and 4); col. 9 lines

5-19]

13.   As to claim 17, Matsushima A staggercasting receiver, for receiving a composite

signal [abstract; figs. 3-5; col. 8 lines 31-40] comprising a set of encoded signals,

staggered in time, representing content, [fig. 3; fig. 5 (5a, 5b); col. 9 lines 5-14, 42-50]

the set capable of being decoded to produce a corresponding set of decoded signals,

[fig. 6 (15a, 15b); col. 10 lines 32-40, 53-65] each decoded signal having a quality

different from the qualities of the decoded signals corresponding to the other encoded

signals, [fig. 6 (15a, 15b); col. 10 lines 32-40, col. 10 lines 13-20 - modulated signal is

up converted and amplified; col. 11 lines 18-25 - signal is down converted and

demodulated; col. 10 lines 53 - col. 11 lines 6; the signals represent differing qualities

being high quality signals and low quality signals] the receiver comprising: a

demultiplexer, responsive to the composite signal, for extracting the set of encoded

signals, [fig. 6; col. 10 lines 46-65 (emphasis lines 50-52)] detecting errors in respective

encoded signals, and producing a subset of available extracted signals which are not

erroneous; [fig. 6; col. 10 lines 46-65; col. 11 lines 36-60] a decoder, [fig. 5 (15a and 15b); fig. 7 (15a and 15b)] coupled to the demultiplexer [fig. 6 (14)] and responsive to the error representative signal, for reproducing a content representative signal at a selectable desired quality. [abstract; fig. 6 (15a, 15b); col. 10 lines 32-40, 46-65; col. 11 lines 36-60]

Matsushima does not explicitly teach a storage device, coupled to the decoder, for storing the reproduced content representative signal.

Yun discloses a storage device, coupled to the decoder, for storing the reproduced content representative signal. [fig. 7 (600 and 600-1); col. 5 lines 42-60; - it is well known in the art that a frame buffer is a video output device that drives a video display from a memory buffer containing a complete frame of data. Therefore, it is well known in the art that a frame buffer is a required component of the decoder for displaying of video data.]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Yun with the device of Matsushima allowing for viewer selection of preferred viewing quality of transmitted video.

14.   As to claim 19, Matsushima (modified by Yun) teaches wherein the decoder [Matsushima - fig. 5 (15a and 15b); fig. 7 (15a and 15b)] comprises circuitry for reproducing a content representative signal at a selectable desired quality from the subset of available extracted encoded signals is a content representative signal at the desired quality is not available. [Matsushima - col. 10 line 53 - col. 11 line 6]

15.   As to the 21,   Matsushima (modified by Yun) teaches wherein the decoder [Matsushima - fig. 5 (15a and 15b); fig. 7 (15a and 15b)]   further comprises circuitry for storing preset selection parameters, [Yun - abstract; col. 7 lines 41-65; col. 8 lines 40-48, 55-62; col. 9 line 54 - col. 10 line 7; col. 9 line 17-53] and for automatically reproducing the content representative signal at the desired quality in response to the selection parameters. [Matsushima - col. 10 line 53 - col. 11 line 6]

16.   As to claim 24,   Matsushima (modified by Yun) teaches wherein further comprises circuitry for storing selection parameters in response to user input. [Yun - abstract; col. 7 lines 41-65; col. 8 lines 40-48, 55-62; col. 9 line 54 - col. 10 line 7]

17.   As to claim 28,   Matsushima (modified by Yun) teaches wherein the television program information carrying signal carries data representing either or both of a program map table (PMT) and a program and information systems protocol-virtual channel table (PSIP-VCT). [Yun - col. 6 line 61-65; col. 8 line 55 - col. 9 line 12; col. 9 line 28 - PMT is contained with the PSIP]

18.   Claims 7 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushima et al. US 6,535,717 in view of Yun US 6,700,624 further in view of Logan et al. US 5,371,551.

19.   As to claim 6, Matsushima (modified by Yun) teaches the limitations of claim 1.

        Matsushima (modified by Yun) does not teach explicitly wherein the step of selecting the desired quality automatically comprises the step of selecting the desired quality in response to the status of the storage device.

Logan teaches wherein the step of selecting the desired quality automatically comprises the step of selecting the desired quality in response to the status of the storage device. [col. 5 line 65 - col. 6 line 3]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Logan with the teachings of Matsushima (modified by Yun) allowing for improved efficiency and storage capacity.

20.   As to claim 7, Matsushima (modified by Yun and Logan) teaches wherein if the status of the storage device indicates that the storage device is nearly full, the desired quality is automatically a lower quality. [Logan - col. 5 line 65 - col. 6 line 3]

21.   As to claim 23, Matsushima (modified by Yun) teaches the limitations of claim 22. Matsushima (modified by Yun) does not explicitly teach wherein the decoder automatically reproduces the content representative signal at a lower quality in response to the status representative signal indicating that the storage device is nearly full.

Logan teaches wherein the decoder automatically reproduces the content representative signal at a lower quality in response to the status representative signal indicating that the storage device is nearly full. [col. 5 line 65 - col. 6 line 3]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Logan with the teachings of Matsushima (modified by Yun) allowing for improved efficiency and storage capacity.

22.   Claims 13-16 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushima et al. US 6,535,717 in view of Yun US 6,700,624 further in view of Birru et al. US 2002/0181581.

23.   As to claim 13, Matsushima (modified by Yun) teaches the limitations of claim 1. Matsushima (modified by Yun) discloses robust encoding. [Matsushima - fig. 5 (7); col. 9 lines 52-57; fig. 7 (7)]

   However, Matsushima (modified by Yun) does not explicitly teach wherein the encoding step comprises the step of encoding at least one of the set of encoded signals using a technique which is robust relative to the encoding of the other encoded signals.

   Birru teaches wherein the encoding step comprises the step of encoding at least one of the set of encoded signals using a technique which is robust relative to the encoding of the other encoded signals. [fig. 2; fig. 4; ¶ 0018-0020; ¶ 0029-0031]

   It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Birru with the teachings of Matsushima allowing for backward compatibility with existing receivers. [Birru - ¶ 0012]

24.   As to claim 14, Matsushima (modified by Yun and Birru) wherein the at least one robust encoded signal comprises the encoded signal corresponding to the lowest quality decoded signal. [Matsushima - fig. 5 (7); col. 9 lines 45-57; fig. 7 (7); Birru - fig. 2; fig. 4; ¶ 0018-0020; ¶ 0029-0031]

25.   As to claim 15, Matsushima (modified by Yun and Birru) teaches wherein the set of encoded signals are channel encoded, and the robust encoded signals are channel encoded using a channel coding technique robust relative to the channel coding

technique used for the non-robust encoded signals. . [Matsushima - fig. 5 (7); col. 9 lines 45-57; fig. 7 (7); Birru - fig. 2; fig. 4; ¶ 0018-0020; ¶ 0029-0031]

26.   As to claim 16, Matsushima (modified by Yun and Birru) teaches wherein the channel coding for the robust encoded signals is one of 4-VSB or 2-VSB modulation and the channel coding for the non-robust encoded signals is 8-VSB modulation. [Birru - fig. 2; fig. 4; ¶ 0018-0020; ¶ 0029-0031]

27.   As to claim 29, Matsushima (modified by Yun) teaches the limitations of claim 17. Matsushima (modified by Yun) discloses robust encoding. [fig. 5 (7); col. 9 lines 52-57; fig. 7 (7)]

Matsushima (modified by Yun) does not explicitly teach wherein at least one of the set of encoded signals is encoded using a technique which is robust relative to the encoding of the other signals, [Birru - fig. 2; fig. 4; ¶ 0018-0020; ¶ 0029-0031] and the decoder comprises a decoder, responsive to the at least one encoded signal, for decoding the at least one encoded signal. [Matsushima - fig. 5 (7); col. 9 lines 45-57; fig. 7 (7); Birru - fig. 2; fig. 4; ¶ 0018-0020; ¶ 0029-0031]

Birru teaches wherein at least one of the set of encoded signals is encoded using a technique which is robust relative to the encoding of the other signals, [Birru - fig. 2; fig. 4; ¶ 0018-0020; ¶ 0029-0031] and the decoder comprises a decoder, responsive to the at least one encoded signal, for decoding the at least one encoded signal. [Matsushima - fig. 5 (7); col. 9 lines 45-57; fig. 7 (7); Birru - fig. 2; fig. 4; ¶ 0018-0020; ¶ 0029-0031]

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Birru with the teachings of Matsushima allowing for backward compatibility with existing receivers. [Birru - ¶ 0012]

28.   As to claim 30, Matsushima (modified by Yun and Birru) teaches wherein the at least one robust encoded signal comprises the encoded signal corresponding to the lowest quality decoded signal. [Matsushima - fig. 5 (7); col. 9 lines 45-57; fig. 7 (7); Birru - fig. 2; fig. 4; ¶ 0018-0020; ¶ 0029-0031]

29.   As to claim 31, Matsushima (modified by Yun and Birru) teaches wherein: the set of encoded signals are channel coded, and the robust encoded signals are channel encoded using one of 4-VSB or 2-VSB modulation and the other encoded signals are channel encoded using 8-VSB modulation; [Birru - fig. 2; fig. 4; ¶ 0018-0020; ¶ 0029-0031 and the decoder comprises a demodulator for channel decoding the robust encoded signals using one of 4-VSB or 2-VSB demodulation and channel decoding the other encoded signals using 8-VSB demodulation. [Matsushima - fig. 5 (7); col. 9 lines 45-57; fig. 7 (7); Birru - fig. 2; fig. 4; ¶ 0018-0020; ¶ 0029-0031]

30.   Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsushima et al. US 6,535,717 in view of Yun US 6,700,624 further in view of Nakamura et al US 6,687,305.

31.   As to claim 32, Matsushima (modified by Yun) teaches wherein the composite signal comprises the et of encoded signals such that a lowest quality decoded signal is undelayed, [fig. 5 (1, 2, 5b); col. 9 lines 1-19] and the other encoded signals are delayed

with respect to the encoded signal corresponding to the lowest quality decoded signal such that the higher the quality of the corresponding decoded signal, the longer the delay period. [fig. 5 (1 and 4); fig. 7 (1 and 4); col. 9 lines 5-19]

Matsushima (modified by Yun) does not explicitly teach and the receiver further comprising a plurality of delay circuits, coupled between the demultiplexer and the decoder and respectively responsive to the set of extracted encoded signals, for realigning the extracted encoded signals in time.

Nakamura teaches the receiver further comprising a plurality of delay circuits, [fig. 3 (52, 51) ; fig. 3 (52, 51, 62); fig. 5 (52, 51, 62); fig. 7 (52, 51, 62)] coupled between the demultiplexer [fig. 3 (21); fig. 5 (21); fig. 7 (21)] and the decoder [fig. 3 (63, 61); fig. 5 (61, 63); fig. 7 (61, 63)] and respectively responsive to the set of extracted encoded signals, for realigning the extracted encoded signals in time. [fig. 3; fig. 5; fig. 7; col. 7 lines 4-20; col. 8 lines 55-59]

It would obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Nakamura with the teachings of Matsushima allowing for improved signal transmission for display/reproduction.

Conclusion

32.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

33.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to ANNER HOLDER whose telephone number is

(571)270-1549. The examiner can normally be reached on M-W, M-W 8 am-3 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Joseph Ustaris can be reached on 571-272-7383. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Anner Holder/
Examiner, Art Unit 2621